DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 820 CG 023 031

AUTHOR Swisher, John D.; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation of Student Assistance Programs in Pennsylvania.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Dept. of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology, and Rehabilitation Services.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 90
CONTRACT S184A90145
NOTE 71p.; Paper presented at the Annual American School Counselor Association Elementary/Middle/Secondary School Guidance Conference (21st, Pittsburgh, PA, June 30-July 3, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Helping Relationship; *High Risk Students; High Schools; *High School Students; Identification; Intervention; *Program Effectiveness; Referral; Student Behavior; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Student Assistance Programs

ABSTRACT

Student Assistance Programs (SAPs) are considered an effective intervention for at-risk students. School faculty and staff are trained to identify and refer students whose personal and/or academic behaviors change in a problematic way. Once identified, the students are provided special services which include referral to community agencies for additional help. Pennsylvania initiated intensive training of SAP teams to coordinate secondary school SAPs in 1984. SAP teams are currently represented in almost every senior high school across the state. An evaluation was conducted on the first 69 teams trained between 1986 and 1988, assessing perceptions of SAP training, SAP implementation, and school-wide SAP impact on student behavior. Separate surveys were completed by SAP coordinators, core team members, and non-core team members. The results indicated that one-half of the coordinators were school administrators. The problems most frequently called to the attention of SAP teams included substance abuse, poor grades, depression, and discipline. Teachers were the primary source of referrals. In general, the core team members rated their training very highly. Training and implementation of SAPs reportedly has run smoothly for most schools and there was a perception among respondents that SAPs had a positive impact on students. This report presents findings from the evaluation, including a results section with 47 data tables; a description of the school-wide impact analysis; references; and appendices of survey instruments and relevant materials. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326820

AN EVALUATION OF STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN PENNSYLVANIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John D Swisher
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

John D. Swisher, Ph.D.
Stanley B. Baker, Ph.D.
James A. Barnes, M.Ed.
Melanie K. Doebler, M.Ed.
Debra E. Haldeman, M.Ed.
Kelly M. Kophazi, B.A.

The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology, and Rehabilitation Services Education

December 1990

This project was sponsored in part by
The United States Office of Education,
PR/Award No. S184A90145

CG023031

AN EVALUATION OF
STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
IN PENNSYLVANIA

by

John D. Swisher, Ph.D.

Stanley B. Baker, Ph.D.

James A. Barnes, M.Ed.

Melanie K. Doebler, M.Ed.

Debra E. Haldeman, M.Ed.

Kelly M. Kophazi, B.A.

The Pennsylvania State University
Department of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology,
and Rehabilitation Services Education

December 1990

This project was sponsored in part by
The United States Office of Education,
PR/Award No. S184A90145

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 1

An Evaluation of Student Assistance Programs In Pennsylvania .. 3

Current Descriptive Survey Analysis 5
Retrospective Comparative Analysis 8

Results 11

SAP Core Team Coordinator Telephone Survey 11

Table 1 - Primary Role in School District 11
Table 2 - Level of Education 11
Table 3 - Perceptions of Time Needed to Implement SAP Teams 12
Table 4 - Perceptions of Degree of Recognition 12
Table 5 - Perceptions of Observable Behaviors 13
Table 6 - Perceptions of Involvement of Family in Intervention Process 14
Table 7 - Perceptions of Forms of Family Participation ... 14
Table 8 - Perceptions of Parental Responsiveness and Helpfulness 14
Table 9 - Perceptions of Sources of Referrals 15
Table 10 - Perceptions of Primary Source for Referrals 15
Table 11 - Perceptions of Referrals to Outside Agencies ... 16
Table 12 - Perceptions of Primary Outside Agencies Used ... 16
Table 13 - Perceptions of Percentage Helped Per Year, Within the School System 17
Table 14 - Perceptions of Percentage Receiving Follow-up Care 17
Table 15 - Perceptions of Levels of Authorization 17
Table 16 - Perceptions of Community Support 18
Table 17 - Perceptions of Faculty Awareness 18
Table 18 - Perceptions of In-School Assistance 19
Table 19 - Perceptions of Who Decides Core Team Membership 19
Table 20 - Perceptions of Frequency of Team Meetings 19

Core Team Member Survey 20

Table 21 - Primary Role in School District 20
Table 22 - Primary Course Taught by Core Team Members who are Teachers 20
Table 23 - Years of Experience in Present School 21
Table 24 - Years of Experience in Education 21
Table 25 - Highest Level of Formal Education 21
Table 26 - Gender 22
Table 27 - Age 22
Table 28 - Perceptions of SAP Training 23
Table 29 - Perceptions of Implementation of SAP 25
Table 30 - Perceptions of Referral Sources 26

Table 31 - Perceptions of Degree of Cooperation Received by the SAP Team 27

Non-Core Team Member Survey 28

Table 32 - Primary Role in School District 28
Table 33 - Primary Course Taught by Non-Core Team Members who are Teachers 28
Table 34 - Years of Experience in Present School 29
Table 35 - Years of Experience in Education 29
Table 36 - Highest Level of Formal Education 29
Table 37 - Gender 30
Table 38 - Age 30
Table 39 - Have Made Referrals to the SAP Team 31
Table 40 - Number of Referrals Made 31
Table 41 - Behaviors Observed, Resulting in Referral 32
Table 42 - Satisfaction With Response to Referral 33
Table 43 - Have Never Referred, But Would if Necessary 33
Table 44 - Participated in Inservice Training 33
Table 45 - Perceptions of Quality of Training 34
Table 46 - Perceptions of Effect of SAP on Their School ... 34
Table 47 - Perceptions of SAP Purpose 35

Result of School-Wide Impact Analysis 36

Conclusions and Recommendations 37

References 39

Appendices:

A - EQA Items Included in School-Wide Impact Analysis 40
B - Post-Test Means for SAP Schools Vs. Non SAP Schools 43
C - Analysis of Covariance 44
D - Core Team Coordinator Telephone Survey 45
E - Core Team Member Survey 56
F - Non-Core Team Member Survey 62

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
AN EVALUATION OF STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Student Assistance Programs (SAPs) emerged in educational settings as an effective intervention for at-risk students. School faculty and staff are trained to identify and refer students whose patterns of personal and/or academic behaviors change in a negative or problematic direction. Once identified, the students, and often their parents, are provided special services which include referral to community agencies for additional help.

Pennsylvania initiated intensive training of SAP teams to coordinate secondary school SAPs in 1984. Today SAP teams are represented in almost every senior high school across the Commonwealth. This evaluation focused on the first 69 teams trained between 1986 and 1988. The purposes of this evaluation were threefold:

1. To assess perceptions of SAP training;

2. To assess perceptions of SAP implementation; and

3. To assess school-wide SAP impact on student behavior.

Three surveys were developed in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Education. One survey was a telephone protocol for SAP coordinators, the second, a questionnaire for core team members, and the third, a questionnaire for non-core team members. The SAP coordinators distributed questionnaires in the respective schools, while Penn State staff conducted telephone interviews of SAP coordinators. All data were collected during February and March of 1990. The school-wide impact was based on existing data made available through the Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) testing program. Eighty-two percent of the schools contacted agreed to participate.

SAP coordinator survey results indicated that half of coordinators were school administrators and only 14% were teachers. The preponderance of administrators may be the result of school districts having added many additional teams and using the administration as central coordinators. The coordinators reported that 82% of their programs were in operation in fewer than 5 months after training. Most SAPs have separate budgets and release time for working with students.

The problems most frequently called to the attention of SAP teams include substance abuse (88%); poor grades (84%); depression (84%); and discipline (82%). Teachers were the primary source of referrals, and the vast majority of families (82%) are contacted for these problems. Outpatient drug and alcohol agencies were the

primary outside agency used (75%), while outpatient mental health agencies were second most frequently used (53%).

Core team members reported extensive experience in educational fields and taught traditional basic subjects in schools (i.e., English, math, science and history). Almost three quarters of the SAP team members reported earning advanced degrees.

In general, the core team members rated their training very highly and particularly felt that their training for identifying and working with at-risk students was exceptional. Conversely, core team members felt that training for follow-up and aftercare services for students once they returned from outside treatment services was only average. Similarly, core team members perceived the implementation of SAP services as being strongest in the identification, intervention and referral processes although weakest in the services for students who require aftercare after returning from treatment. Other respondents reported high levels of awareness of the services. Over two-thirds (68%) referred students to the SAP team. The majority of respondents (87%) said they would refer if the need arose.

Eleven (11) schools which had previously been part of the Commonwealth's Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) testing program and had SAP teams trained between 1986 and 1988 were identified and compared with schools which did not have SAPs operating. The EQA battery measures all 11th graders on 12 different education-related goals. Answers to questions related to alcohol and other drug use and self-esteem were used to compare all students in the 11 identified SAP schools with all students in 11 schools without SAPs.

Students in schools with SAPs were significantly ($P<.02$) more willing to confront their friends about the risks of smoking. Furthermore, students in schools with SAPs were slightly higher (not statistically significant) on 18 of 28 items selected for this analysis to resist using beer or liquor, more willing to refer a friend to a teacher, and higher in self-esteem levels.

Training and implementation of SAPs reportedly has run smoothly for most schools and there is a perception among respondents that SAPs have a positive impact on students. Nevertheless, there remains a need to restructure training to more adequately address the delivery of services for students when reentering school routines following treatment. There also is a need to focus more on behavioral outcomes for those referred to SAPs. Due to fiscal limitations, however, it was impossible to track students individually served by SAP teams.

AN EVALUATION OF STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Student Assistance Programs (SAPs) have emerged in educational settings as an effective intervention with at-risk students. School faculty and administrators are trained to identify and refer a student whose pattern of academic or personal behavior changes in a negative direction. A team of faculty, pupil personnel and administrative staff meet with the referred students and/or their parents to develop intervention plans that will return students to maximum performance.

Student Assistance Programs (SAPs) are modeled after Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs) which were designed to help troubled employees. The basic idea behind the SAP concept is to identify students such as those exhibiting low or decreased academic productivity, psychological difficulty, or disruptive behavior and to intervene in a comprehensive manner. SAPs were developed based on the same rationale EAPs are based on: that when an employee develops substance abuse problems, his or her performance is impaired and on-the-job productivity declines. By the same token, SAPs center around the premise that a student's school performance will be adversely affected by substance abuse problems. The rationale for both SAPs and EAPs concludes that when substance abuse issues are dealt with and resolved, the individual's capacity to function effectively will increase (Griffin and Svendson, 1980). One assumption on which SAP programs were based was that chemical abuse may be the cause of decreased academic productivity. However, school staff members are not expected to diagnose substance abuse or dependency. They are simply expected to recognize changing behavior patterns. Since SAPs were introduced, the recognized causes of decreased productivity have been expanded to include a variety of mental health, social, and behavioral problems.

Introduction of the Student Assistance Program concept to schools occurred in response to several factors. One factor was the existence and relative success of EAPs in business and industry where the idea of systematic interventions had already been implemented. A second factor was an awareness of evidence that high levels of chemical abuse existed among adolescents in America (Bachman, Johnson, & O'Malley, 1989; Governors Drug Policy Council, 1990). Related to the evidence of high levels of abuse was a third factor, substance abuse is negatively related to academic performance (Friedman, Glickman, & Utada, 1985; Kandel, 1980; Swisher & Hu, 1983). Fourth, there was evidence that adolescents were hesitant to seek help voluntarily for drug and alcohol problems from traditional sources (Swisher, Shute, & Bibeau, 1984). Finally, most schools did not seem to have systems in place that were well enough defined or organized to deal with at-risk students who needed dramatic interventions if constructive changes were to occur.

Although SAPs led to more systematic opportunities for at-risk adolescents to receive help then was the case before their inception, there is not yet a national consensus as to the best model for SAPs leaving communities and states to create their own definitions (Roman, 1989). Three types or models of SAPs seem to have evolved. Borris (1988) labeled them the Externally Based, Internally Based, and Core Team models. In the Externally Based model, specialized staff to whom referrals can be made for intervention services were contracted outside of the school system. In the Internally Based model, specialized staff members were hired by the school district to respond to referrals and to provide intervention services. In the Core Team model, teams are formed at each school and receive special intervention training. After training, the teams develop and implement systems for identifying at-risk students, confronting them, referring them to outside experts, and establishing aftercare programs when the students return to school.

In 1986, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency funded a three-year demonstration project entitled the Pennsylvania Comprehensive Drug and Alcohol Prevention/Intervention Program. Student Assistance Programs were one of five components in this program, the others included: (a) Curriculum, (b) Elementary Absenteeism Program, (c) Student Leadership Program, and (d) a Parent Education Program. Management of the implementation of Student Assistance Programs became the responsibility of the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDOE). The Core Team model was adopted as the PDOE worked with an increasingly larger number of school districts.

Core Teams were to have representation from several distinct categories of professionals including: central and building administrators, pupil personnel specialists (i.e., psychologists, counselors, and nurses), teachers, and community substance abuse or mental health specialists. Five school districts participated in the start-up period. With assistance from Villanova University's Human Organization Science Institute, the PDOE decided that success of SAPs was to be determined by several key elements: (a) consistent substance abuse policies in school districts, (b) carefully selected Core Team members, (c) a standardized training program, (d) good public relations, (e) efficient operations when starting SAPs in the selected schools, (f) networks of community resources able to provide diagnostic and treatment services, and (g) maintenance of effort (Kelley & Peters, 1989).

The PDOE introduced a 5-day residential training program consisting of an array of topics such as: (a) theories of adolescent development, (b) family dynamics, (c) the nature of chemical dependence, (d) the enabling process, (e) adolescent depression and suicide, (f) the SAP process, (g) the treatment process, (h) a psychodrama about a problem family, (i) demonstrations of SAP interventions, and (j) action planning.

Monies from the PDOE Drug and Alcohol Section and a Masonic Lodge helped to establish a common site for all Commonwealth sponsored training programs. Federal Law Enforcement and Assistance Administration funds for school-based prevention and intervention services distributed by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency and Federal Department of Education Drug Free Community funds distributed by the PDOE provided incentives to school districts throughout Pennsylvania to establish SAPs. In the case of the Drug Free Schools funds, school districts had to indicate in their proposals how they would be involved in the SAP process by 1990.

When core team training exploded throughout the Commonwealth, no broad scale evaluation of the training by parties independent of the Pennsylvania State Department of Education (PDOE) occurred. Following are evaluation results of the PDOE core team training program by a university research team funded by the U.S. Department of Education. Attention was focused on students, training, and implementation. More specifically, these three variables were operationalized as follows: (a) How good was the core team training? (b) How successful was the implementation process following training? (c) What effect did SAPs have on students? Two approaches were used in the present evaluation: (1) A current survey and analysis of attitudes of the participants in the training programs and of colleagues in the schools where core teams were instituted. In this descriptive analysis, an effort was made to acquire ratings of a broad range of specific components of the training program by those who experienced it and of reactions to the programs after they had been implemented by core team leaders and colleagues who had not been trained but were being influenced by the programs; and (2) A retrospective analysis of standardized assessment data on students attending schools with trained core teams in comparison to students attending a set of schools that did not have trained core teams. In this comparative analysis, it was hypothesized that students in the schools with trained core teams recorded significantly more desirable scores on the assessment data than students at the matched schools did.

Method

Current Descriptive Survey Analysis

This approach was used to determine the quality of the core team training was and how successfully SAP programs were implemented following the training. The opinions of those school professionals who participated in the training programs, implemented the SAPs, or were affected by them are presented below:

Participants

The population for the descriptive survey analysis were the professional staff members of 69 Pennsylvania schools who had staff members trained in the PDOE program between 1984 and 1988. The 69 targeted schools included the 25 schools involved in the retrospective comparative analysis. Three samples of participants were selected from the population: (1) One sample was the core team members at each of the 69 schools who had completed the PDOE training program. PDOE requirements resulted in the formation of teams that had to include teachers, counselors, school nurses, administrators, and someone from the school district's central office staffs. (2) A second sample was representatives of the professional staffs who did not participate in the core team training programs for each of the 69 schools. Each school determined who these individuals would be, taking control of the sampling process from the investigators. (3) The third sample included 69 individuals from each of the participating schools deemed as the core team leaders. These individuals may also have been participants in the first sample above.

Instrumentation

Three surveys were developed by the investigating team, each with a different purpose. As shown in Appendix D, the first survey was developed to seek specific information from individuals assigned leadership roles in the core teams, a second (See Appendix E) was designed to acquire information from the core team members. A third (See Appendix F) was developed to survey individuals who were not members of the core teams.

Core team coordinator survey. Core team coordinators were viewed as able to provide implementation information in more detail and with greater authority than anyone else. This survey consisted of 51 items divided into five sets. It was designed to collect information over the telephone. The first set was the same descriptive questions found in the other two surveys. The second set, seven questions, was designed to find out how quickly following training the SAP programs had been set up, whether they were operational, and how much support and recognition was being received from the school district leaders, school administrators, and local communities. A set of 24 questions was used to gather detailed information about the referral systems in operation across the surveyed schools. The fourth set of questions, 6 in number, was devoted to gathering information about the level of financial support school systems were providing for the SAPs and core team members. The final set, 6 questions, was designed to gather information about the specific activities of the core teams. Some items could be answered by "yes" or "no" responses, some by selecting one of several choices offered by the telephone interviewers, and others were open ended questions. Fifty-seven of

the 69 schools cooperated in this survey for a cooperation rate of 83%. Individual schools were the units of analysis.

Core team member survey. Core team members were in a position to provide information about training and implementation. This survey consisted of 55 items divided into three sets. The first set, eight items, consisted of descriptive questions, providing information about ages, gender, levels of education, length of experience in education, length of experience in the current schools, and specific professional roles in their schools (e.g. teachers, counselors, administrators, and the like). The second set of items asked for ratings of the PDOE training program on a 7-point scale, 1 = low to 7 = high. The 19 items represented the 18 units of the training program and one "others" item. Examples of the units are "family dynamics, group process, and team intervention." The third set, 28 items, requested information about perceptions of how well the SAP programs had been implemented in the core team schools. The 7-point scale was used to rate 15 functions that SAP programs might offer such as "inservice training for faculty members, core-team consultation with identified students, and team meetings." The 7-point scale was also used to assess core team members' opinions about the amount of cooperation received from 12 different types of individuals who might have interactions with the SAP teams (e.g., "parents, teaching staff, and school counselor"). A final item asked the respondents to rank order sources of referrals to the SAP team such as "self-referrals, school's teachers, and peer referrals."

The core team member surveys were mailed in packages to the team coordinators at each of the 69 schools that agreed to cooperate. The coordinators controlled the circumstances under which they were distributed and completed. Completed questionnaires were returned individually in self-addressed envelopes, one of which accompanied each survey. Sixty-three of the 69 schools cooperated in conducting the survey. 390 of 690 surveys were returned and usable for a 57% return rate. Individual surveys and items were one unit of analysis, and schools were a second unit of analysis.

Non-core team member survey. Non-core team members were able to provide information about implementation from the perspective of someone removed from the training programs. Consisting of 19 items, this survey had two sets of questions. The first set were the same descriptive questions that were in the core team member survey. The second set, 11 questions, was focused on how clearly the respondents understood the purpose of the SAPs in their schools, whether or not they made referrals to the SAP team and, if so, how often, whether or not they were satisfied with the SAP teams' performances, whether or not there was inservice training for non-team staff members and how effective said training was viewed to have been, and general impressions on how SAPs had benefitted the schools.

The procedures for distributing and collecting the non-core team member surveys were the same as for the core team member surveys. An additional component was allowing the core team coordinators to determine what staff members in their schools would be asked to complete the surveys. It was recommended that they use a stratified random sampling procedure. Each survey was accompanied by an individual, anonymous envelope to be returned. Fifty-four of the 69 schools cooperated with this survey. Of 345 surveys, 202 were returned for a 59% return rate. Individual surveys and items were one unit of analysis, and individual schools were a second unit of analysis.

Procedures

The Pennsylvania Department of Education Drug and Alcohol Education Section provided support and assistance by offering the information needed to identify schools to be included in the investigation, sending letters to administrators in those schools encouraging them to participate in the studies and by presenting drafts of the surveys to members of their SAP Advisory Board for editing and for content and procedural recommendations.

Telephone survey. Items for the telephone survey also were derived from studies of the content and purpose of SAP training and programming in Pennsylvania and evaluated by members of the SAP Advisory Board. The principal investigators developed protocols for the telephone survey based on recommendations by the Department of Education staff and the SAP Advisory Board members. Seven graduate student members of the investigating team were trained to follow protocols of the telephone survey and proceeded to make arrangements to call designated contact persons at the cooperating schools and conduct the telephone interviews. The interviews averaged 30 to 45 minutes in length. Data from the interviews were coded and recorded for analyses.

Mailed surveys. Members of the investigating team developed original sets of items based on studies of the content and purpose of SAP training and programming in Pennsylvania. Surveys were constructed, edited, and evaluated by members of the SAP Advisory Board. Packages of surveys were mailed to the cooperating schools and returned via the mails. The mailed survey data were collected over a period of 6 weeks. Individual surveys were coded and data were recorded for analyses by members of the investigating team.

Retrospective Comparative Analysis

This analysis served as a vehicle for assessing the effect SAPs had on students. Because no uniform statewide program for assessing the effects of SAPs was in place, data from an existent statewide program were adapted for the current study. Specifically, schools that had initiated SAP programs were compared

with other schools that did not have SAPs on variables reflecting student attitudes that may vary, perhaps due to existence of SAPs.

Subjects

The subject population were eleventh graders at the schools that were selected for the present comparative analysis who had completed the Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) battery before and after the school team was trained. In the present study, schools rather than individuals were the units of analysis. Therefore, the subject sample consisted of eleventh grade students who completed the EQA questionnaires in 11 SAP schools and 11 comparison schools without SAPs. The total number of students was approximately 4,000.

Instrumentation

The standardized test data used in the present analysis were available from a data bank of results from the Pennsylvania Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) program. Established in the early 1970s to provide standardized information about the average academic achievements and qualitative (personal-social) environments of participating schools, the EQA test battery consisted of subtests designed to assess school district performances in mathematics, analytical thinking, arts and humanities, science and technology, and communication skills and qualitative variables such as self-esteem, understanding others, work, health, environment, and family living.

In the present analysis, 28 items were selected from the total of 544 possible items across the 24 EQA subtests. Specific items were selected because they were deemed by the investigators as being the most likely variables to be influenced by changes induced by SAP interventions. Examples of the selected items are as follows:

Stem: "My friends decide to have a party. One person brings a case of beer. Everyone else agrees to drink several cans. I would DRINK THE BEER."

Choices: "Definitely Would, Probably Would, Probably Would Not, Definitely Would Not"

Stem: "I feel accepted by my classmates."

Choices: "Strongly Agree, Mostly Agree, Mostly Disagree, Strongly Disagree"

Each selected item was analyzed independently. The average for each school selected for the study on every selected item was the unit of analysis.

Procedures

Organizing the data. Eleven Pennsylvania school districts were identified that had teams which had completed the PDOE core team training and for whom usable EQA data were available before and after SAP training. Eleven schools that had neither participated in core team training nor established SAP programs and had participated in the EQA assessment program at the same time as SAP schools were selected for comparison purposes.

Analyses. The school averages used as the units of analysis included data from all students who participated in the EQA assessment program, only some of whom may have been influenced directly by the Student Assistance Programs in their schools. This was the only way the existing data could be analyzed. Analysis of covariance was used for each of the 28 items with statistical controls on grade enrollment (indicator of school size), size of community, and parents' education (indicator of socio-economic status). Using the school as the unit of analysis reduced the possibility of chance findings.

RESULTS

SAP Core Team Coordinator Telephone Survey

Introduction

This section of the report focuses on the results of the telephone surveys with the team coordinators. Every effort was made to contact the coordinators at the times they indicated on their consent forms and the interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes. Because of the large volume of data to be reported, comments have been interwoven with the tables.

TABLE 1
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PRIMARY ROLE IN SCHOOL DISTRICT
(n = 51)

TEACHERS	14%
ADMINISTRATORS	49%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	12%
OTHER	25%

Nearly half (49%) of team coordinators shown in Table 1 were school administrators, and there was an equal distribution of pupil personnel professionals and teachers serving as coordinators. Of the teachers who served as coordinators, only 14% spent more than half their time in classroom instruction, and the majority taught general education subjects (i.e., math, English, science).

Nearly all coordinators (95%) had more than two years of experience in their present school, with over two-thirds (68%) having over 6 years experience. Approximately half (55%) had over 16 years experience in education. Although nearly half of the administrators had 2-5 years experience in their present schools, the overwhelming majority (99%) had more than 6 years educational experience.

TABLE 2
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' LEVEL OF EDUCATION
(n = 56)

BACHELORS DEGREE	SOME GRADUATE WORK	MASTERS DEGREE	> MASTERS DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE
04%	02%	18%	59%	18%

As shown in Table 2, the majority of coordinators had a specialist's certificate or completed some work beyond a master's degree, and 18% had a doctor's degree. Nearly three-fourths (70%) of the coordinators were males. Both administrators and pupil personnel professionals showed an unequal distribution (of males to females). This pattern indicates that, although there is an equal distribution of males to females on core teams, males dominate coordinator positions. Over half (57%) of the coordinators were between the ages of 40 to 49.

Over half (57%) of the teams designated the individual who was responsible for coordinating the program as either the director, coordinator, or the team leader. If a staff member already had an existing title within the school, often that title remained (i.e., district superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, school psychologist, superintendent, assistant principal). Other titles noted included: secretary, chairperson, moderator, and facilitator.

TABLE 3
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF TIME NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT SAP TEAMS
(n = 56)

< 1 MONTH	1-2 MONTHS	2-5 MONTHS	6-12 MONTHS	> 1 YEAR
30%	14%	38%	16%	02%

The amount of time needed to implement an SAP after training was completed varied between less than 1 month to more than a year (Table 3). Most (82%) of the teams were operational within 5 months of their training, which in most cases was the same academic year as the training.

TABLE 4
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF DEGREE OF RECOGNITION
(n = 56)

OFFICE SPACE	71%
ORGANIZATIONAL CHART	46%
RELEASE TIME	82%
BUDGET	66%

As shown in Table 4, most SAP teams were afforded some recognition by their respective school district, such as providing them office space, release time, or operating budgets. Although 71% were afforded office space, provisions were usually shared

conference rooms. Over half of the SAPs were not in the school's organizational chart, which could contribute to weakness in continuity of care, program development, and communication. The majority of coordinators (82%) were provided release time. Release time, however, comes in many different forms: cafeteria duty, study halls, decreased responsibilities in other areas, after school hours, etc.

Although the majority of the SAPs had an operating budget, only half of SAP coordinators felt it was adequate and few could define what it was. Other degrees of recognition afforded to teams by their respective school districts were: funding (via supportive funds of PennFree), office supplies (materials, telephone, files, computers), secretarial service, and recognition banquets. According to the surveyed coordinators, the majority (91%) of team members receive no pay for serving on SAPs.

TABLE 5
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF OBSERVABLE BEHAVIORS
(n = 56)

SUBSTANCE ABUSE	88%
POOR GRADES	84%
DEPRESSION	84%
DISCIPLINE	82%
SUICIDAL IDEATION	79%
ABSENTEEISM	71%
WITHDRAWN BEHAVIORS	66%
SELF ESTEEM	64%
DELINQUENCY	63%
RUNNING AWAY	54%
ANOREXIA NERVOSA	54%
OTHER	38%
PREGNANCY	36%
SMOKING	32%

Students may be referred to SAPs for a multitude of observable behaviors. As shown in Table 5, over three-fourths demonstrate behaviors such as: substance abuse (88%), poor grades (84%), depression (84%), discipline (82%), and suicidal ideation (79%). Other observable behaviors that resulted in student referrals were noted: health problems, changes in appearance, content of writing

assignments, attitude, sleeping in class, and aggressive behavior. Some student referrals were a result of abuse, dysfunctional families, and divorce in home.

TABLE 6
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF INVOLVEMENT OF FAMILY IN INTERVENTION PROCESS
(n = 55)

0-25% OF FAMILIES	25-50% OF FAMILIES	50-75% OF FAMILIES	75-100% OF FAMILIES
09%	09%	22%	60%

Most (82%) of coordinators surveyed reported that half or more of the families of referred students are involved in the intervention process (Table 6). Family participation in any problem behavior were noted to contribute to improved behaviors in other areas.

TABLE 7
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF FORMS OF FAMILY PARTICIPATION
(n = 56)

CONFERENCES	93%
PHONE CALLS	84%
SEND LETTERS	41%
OTHER	23%

As shown in Table 7, family participation most often takes the form of a conference (93%) and/or telephone call (84%). Only 41% of SAP coordinators said they send letters for documentation.

TABLE 8
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTAL RESPONSIVENESS AND HELPFULNESS

	0-25% OF PARENTS	25-50% OF PARENTS	50-75% OF PARENTS	75-100% OF PARENTS
RESPONSIVE	02%	00%	16%	82%
HELPFUL	04%	09%	48%	39%

The majority (98%; n = 55) of coordinators shown in Table 8 rated parental response as high, with 87% (n = 54) being helpful.

Apparently, when it was necessary to contact the family, their participation was responsive and helpful.

TABLE 9
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF SOURCES OF REFERRALS
(n = 56)

TEACHERS	100%
PARENTS	95%
STUDENTS	93%
SELF	93%
COUNSELOR	93%
STAFF	89%
NURSE	79%
COMMUNITY AGENCIES	48%
OTHER	39%

Respondents were asked about the sources of referrals (Table 9): bus drivers, law enforcement agencies, administrators (as a result of policy violation), team members, school secretary, cafeteria staff, local ministers, and neighbors all were noted. All (100%) coordinators surveyed agreed that teachers were the primary source of referral; while more than 90% report that parents, students, counselors and self-referrals are sources. Less than half see community agencies or others as referral sources. Thus, it might be useful for SAP teams to develop liaisons with community agencies for additional referral sources.

TABLE 10
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF
PRIMARY SOURCE FOR REFERRALS
(n = 51)

TEACHERS	STAFF	COUNSELOR	OTHER
76%	10%	08%	06%

While sources of referral varied, the primary sources, as shown in Table 10, were teachers (76%), followed by staff members (10%), and counselors (8%).

TABLE 11
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF REFERRALS TO OUTSIDE AGENCIES
(n = 53)

10-20% OF IDENTIFIED STUDENTS	30-40% OF IDENTIFIED STUDENTS	50-60% OF IDENTIFIED STUDENTS	70-80% OF IDENTIFIED STUDENTS	90-100% OF IDENTIFIED STUDENTS
21%	32%	21%	17%	09%

Although numerous outside agencies are used as referral sources, only about half (47%) of identified students are referred by SAPs to outside agencies (Table 11).

TABLE 12
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRIMARY OUTSIDE AGENCIES USED
(n = 55)

OUTPATIENT D&A	75%
OUTPATIENT MH	53%
PRIVATE PSYCHOLOGISTS	27%
INPATIENT D&A	27%
HOSPITALS	24%
RESIDENTIAL MH	22%
RESIDENTIAL D&A	16%
OTHER	16%
LAW ENFORCEMENT	04%

As shown in Table 12, the two most frequently used referral resources were: outpatient treatment for drug and alcohol (75%), and outpatient mental health (53%). Besides group homes and aftercare, other agencies to whom referrals have been made were: children and youth probation, children and youth services, AA, COA, Alanon, and community based organizations. The least used source was law enforcement agencies.

TABLE 13
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERCENTAGE HELPED PER YEAR, WITHIN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM
(n = 53)

0-25% OF REFERRED STUDENTS	25-50% OF REFERRED STUDENTS	50-75% OF REFERRED STUDENTS	75-100% OF REFERRED STUDENTS
13%	32%	32%	23%

The majority of coordinators felt that over half the students referred to SAP were helped (Table 13).

TABLE 14
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF PERCENTAGE RECEIVING FOLLOW-UP CARE
(n = 51)

0-25% OF REFERRED STUDENTS	25-50% OF REFERRED STUDENTS	50-75% OF REFERRED STUDENTS	75-100% OF REFERRED STUDENTS
28%	04%	04%	65%

As shown in Table 14, nearly 70% of coordinators surveyed reported that over half of the students receive formal follow-up aftercare services after receiving outside or specialized school treatment.

TABLE 15
CORE TEAM COOPDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF LEVELS OF AUTHORIZATION
(n = 56)

REFER	98%
CONTACT PARENTS	98%
KEEP CONFIDENTIAL RECORDS	89%
DO GROUPS	88%
TEST/SELF-EVALUATIONS	77%
LIMIT ACTIVITIES	29%
GIVE DETENTION	16%

The majority (i.e., between 75 and 100%) of SAPs refer students, evaluate, conduct group counseling, and keep records. However, few perform actions they see as punitive (e.g. detention, limit activities, etc.).

Approximately two-thirds (64%) of the schools called their program SAP, SAT (Student Assistance Team), or SST (Student Support Team). Other names used were: SNAP (Students Needing Assistance Team); STAR (Student Assistance And Referral) and SAR (Students At Risk); Heart; SID (Student Intervention Team); FAME (Faculty Advisors Maintaining Effectiveness); SSS (Student Support Services); SCIP (School/Community Intervention Program); SMART (Students Making A Right Turn); CARE; and PROP (Pupil Reach-Out Program).

TABLE 16
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT
(n = 55)

SUPPORTIVE	NEUTRAL	NON-SUPPORTIVE
78%	15%	07%

The majority (78%) of coordinators shown in Table 16 viewed their community as supportive. Communities also were seen as supportive when businesses, clubs, PTA, and churches allowed SAPs to be presented and/or gave donations. Local TV/radio/newspapers ran ads, and individuals within the community participated at presentations. Lack of support was primarily due to minimal awareness.

TABLE 17
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY AWARENESS
(n = 56)

MEETINGS	89%
WORKSHOPS	54%
OTHER	39%
MEMOS	38%

As shown in Table 17, most SAPs used a variety of ways to make faculty members aware of the SAP process. Primary means were by faculty meetings (89%) and/or inservice training days.

The majority of coordinators (74%) reported that parents were contacted; another 22% said it depends on the circumstances. Almost all (90%) of the schools provide materials to help make parents aware of their SAPs through school newsletters and displays during parent conferences primarily.

TABLE 18
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF IN-SCHOOL ASSISTANCE
(n = 56)

INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING	91%
GROUP COUNSELING	86%
OTHER	29%

The primary means by which identified students are helped within the school system were individual and/or group counseling (Table 18).

TABLE 19
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF WHO DECIDES CORE TEAM MEMBERSHIP
(n = 55)

ADMINISTRATORS	42%
VOLUNTARY	35%
TEAM	20%
OTHER	04%

Core Team membership was primarily decided by administrators (42%) or on a voluntary basis, or the decision rested with the core team itself.

TABLE 20
CORE TEAM COORDINATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF FREQUENCY OF TEAM MEETINGS
(n = 55)

> TWICE A WEEK	TWICE A WEEK	ONCE A WEEK
27%	45%	27%

Nearly half (45%) of the teams meet twice a week with over one-fourth (27%) meeting more than twice a week and an equal number meeting once a week, as shown in Table 20. A majority (93%) of coordinators felt that relationships among core team members were positive. Following implementation of the core teams, only 13% reported more than three members leaving their teams.

Core Team Member Survey

Introduction

The next section of the report focuses on the results of surveys with the core team members.

TABLE 21
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PRIMARY ROLE IN SCHOOL DISTRICT
(n = 352)

TEACHERS	49%
ADMINISTRATORS	13%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	39%
TOTAL	100%

As shown in Table 21, approximately half (49%) of the respondents were teachers who spend more than 50% of their time in the classroom, while over one-third reported occupying a pupil personnel role within their school district. These results show that teachers are very well represented on SAP teams.

TABLE 22
PRIMARY COURSE TAUGHT BY CORE TEAM MEMBERS WHO ARE TEACHERS
(n = 165)

ENGLISH	15%	BUSINESS	04%
SOCIAL STUDIES	15%	READING	04%
SCIENCE	14%	FOREIGN LANGUAGE	03%
HEALTH/PHYSICAL EDUCATION	14%	ART	02%
MATHEMATICS	10%	INDUSTRIAL ARTS	02%
OTHER	10%	MUSIC	01%
SPECIAL EDUCATION	07%		

Teachers who are members of a core team most frequently report teaching general academic subjects (Table 22) (i.e., English, social studies, math, science, health/physical education). A minority of respondents said they taught art (2%), industrial arts (2%), and music (1%).

TABLE 23
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT SCHOOL
(n = 374)

< 1 YEAR	2-5 YEARS	6-15 YEARS	16-25 YEARS	26-35 YEARS	> 35 YEARS
04%	22%	37%	30%	07%	00%

As members of the core team, the overwhelming majority (96%) of respondents had 2 or more years teaching experience in their present school, while nearly three-fourths (74%) had 6 or more years teaching experience. Thus, core team membership was comprised primarily of those with 6-15 years teaching experience at their present school.

TABLE 24
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION
(n = 374)

< 1 YEAR	2-5 YEARS	6-15 YEARS	16-25 YEARS	26-35 YEARS	> 35 YEARS
01%	07%	30%	47%	14%	01%

Core teams are overwhelmingly (92%) comprised of those who reported over 6 years teaching experience in education (Table 24). In fact, nearly two-thirds (62%) reported 16 or more years experience in education. This pattern indicates that core teams exhibit highly experienced educators, an important element in the potential success of core SAP teams.

TABLE 25
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' HIGHEST LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION
(n = 375)

BACHELORS DEGREE	SOME GRADUATE WORK	MASTERS DEGREE	> MASTERS DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE
03%	20%	24%	46%	06%

As shown in Table 25, nearly three-fourths (76%) of core team members reported having earned a Master's Degree or above, showing that core-team members are comprised primarily of those who have taken advanced degree work beyond a bachelor's degree. While this pattern may reflect the certification requirement of all Pennsylvania teachers, it also suggests that these respondents are a motivated and concerned group of educators.

TABLE 26
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' GENDER
(n = 372)

	FEMALE	MALE
TEACHERS	26%	20%
ADMINISTRATORS	03%	11%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	26%	15%
TOTAL	54%	46%

Table 26 displays a categorization of type of position by gender. While there is a generally equal proportion of females (54%) and males (46%) overall, there also is a fairly large percentage point differential among female (26%) and male (15%) pupil personnel educators. Likewise, there is a fairly large difference between female (3%) and male (11%) administrator core team respondents.

TABLE 27
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' AGE
(n = 374)

TWENTY - TWENTY-NINE	THIRTY - THIRTY-NINE	FORTY - FORTY-NINE	FIFTY - FIFTY-NINE	OVER SIXTY
05%	30%	42%	20%	03%

As shown in Table 27, the largest percentage (42%) of core team members reported they were between the ages of 40-49, while nearly one-third (30%) said they were between 30-39 years old. These age group results show a large component of both professionally (see Table 23) and chronologically mature educators, which may enhance the training and implementation of future SAP programs.

TABLE 28
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SAP TRAINING

	STATISTICS			RATINGS		
	MEAN*	SD	n	LOW	AVG	HI
ENABLING PROCESS	5.84	1.07	380	01%	22%	76%
ASSESSMENT/INTERVENTION PROCESS	5.81	1.14	381	02%	23%	75%
NATURE OF CHEMICAL DEPENDENCY	5.71	1.07	382	02%	26%	73%
FORMAL/INFORMAL INTERVENTION	5.66	1.14	379	02%	28%	70%
TEAM INTERVENTION	5.59	1.17	377	02%	31%	67%
SAP OVERVIEW	5.56	1.15	377	02%	31%	67%
ADOLESCENT DEPRESSION/ SUICIDE	5.49	1.27	380	04%	30%	66%
COA/DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILIES	5.36	1.30	376	05%	33%	62%
FAMILY DYNAMICS	5.22	1.28	381	05%	40%	54%
GROUP PROCESS	4.99	1.40	377	08%	42%	50%
ACTION PLANNING	4.97	1.37	374	08%	45%	47%
PSYCHODRAMA	4.94	1.63	375	12%	38%	50%
TREATMENT PROCESS	4.82	1.22	377	07%	51%	42%
ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT	4.82	1.27	379	07%	52%	41%
TEAM MAINTENANCE	4.82	1.44	381	11%	46%	42%
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	4.79	1.34	372	08%	50%	42%
INDIVIDUAL PROCESS IN GROUPS	4.54	1.38	369	12%	54%	35%
CONTINUITY OF CARE	4.41	1.32	377	13%	57%	30%

* The rating of SAP training ranged from 1 to 7 points with higher ratings indicating higher quality.

Core team members were asked to rate various features of the SAP training received on a 7-point scale with 1 representing the lowest score and 7 indicating the highest score. As shown in Table 28, the training sessions rated highest included: Enabling Process, Assessment and Intervention, Nature of Chemical

Dependency, SAP Overview, and Formal/Informal Intervention. On the other hand, Continuity of Care, Individual Process in Groups, Program Development, Psychodrama, and Team Maintenance were rated lower. Also shown in Table 28, the 7-point scale was then collapsed and redefined as a 3-point scale, with 1 being lowest, 2 representing average, and 3 indicating highest ratings. Approximately three-fourths of core team respondents rated the Enabling Process (76%), Assessment/Intervention Process (75%) and Nature of Chemical Dependency (73%) highly. The most frequently cited low ratings, however, were Continuity of Care (13%), Psychodrama (12%), Individual Processes in Groups (12%) and Team Maintenance. These lower ratings of SAP training components involve the follow-up, aftercare, and maintenance of the training program, which quite possibly should be more extensively monitored for longer periods of time.

TABLE 29
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF SAP

	STATISTICS			RATINGS		
	MEAN*	SD	n	LOW	AVG	HI
REFERRING STUDENTS TO OUTSIDE AGENCIES	5.91	1.11	376	02%	19%	79%
TEAM MEETINGS	5.89	1.27	384	03%	20%	77%
REFERRAL OF IDENTIFIED STUDENTS TO CORE TEAM	5.70	1.07	380	02%	24%	74%
INDIVIDUAL CONSULTING WITH STUDENTS	5.69	1.16	373	03%	25%	72%
IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENTS NEEDING HELP	5.61	1.05	365	03%	26%	71%
CORE TEAM CONSULTATION WITH IDENTIFIED STUDENTS	5.55	1.30	364	05%	27%	69%
SERVICE TO STUDENTS TREATED OUTSIDE	5.06	1.46	340	09%	39%	52%
ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT PROGRAMS IN SCHOOL	4.57	1.70	279	19%	39%	42%
GROUPS IN SCHOOL FOR STUDENTS	4.50	1.89	317	23%	35%	42%
INSERVICE TRAINING FOR FACULTY	4.35	1.70	350	22%	41%	37%
MONITORING STUDENTS REFERRED OUTSIDE	4.34	1.50	356	17%	51%	32%
AWARENESS PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS	4.33	1.49	344	17%	51%	33%
PLANNED SERVICES AFTER RETURN TO SCHOOL	4.04	1.76	303	30%	38%	32%
AFTERCARE ARRANGED TREATMENT FACILITIES	4.02	1.64	296	26%	46%	28%
AWARENESS PROGRAM FOR PARENTS/GUARDIANS	3.69	1.48	312	29%	54%	17%

* The rating of SAP training ranged from 1 to 7 points with higher ratings indicating higher quality.

Core team members were asked to rate their perception of SAP implementation. As shown in Table 29, core team members rated

implementation on a 7-point scale with 1 representing the lowest rating and 7 meaning highest rating. The mean, standard deviation, and frequency of their responses as shown in Table 29 are discussed below. The core team members felt Referral to Outside Agencies, Team Meetings, Referral to Core Teams, Individual Consultation, and Identification of Students Needing Help were implemented very well. Nevertheless, their perceptions of the Awareness Programs for Students, Planned Services After Return to School, Aftercare, and Awareness Programs for Parents/Guardians were implemented less effectively. It is important to pay close attention to awareness, aftercare, and planned services because available services and reinforcement from parents/guardians is a critical component of the long-term success of future SAPs. These findings also may indicate a major weakness in the current processes used to communicate the existence and benefits of SAP to students, agencies, and to parents or guardians.

TABLE 30
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF REFERRAL SOURCES

RANK	SOURCE	LOW	AVG	HI	n
1	TEACHERS	01%	04%	95%	373
2	ADMINISTRATORS	02%	18%	80%	362
3	SELF-REFERRALS	15%	72%	13%	342
4	PEER REFERRALS	04%	66%	30%	350
5	PARENT OR GUARDIAN	08%	67%	25%	358
6	OTHER PROFESSIONALS	05%	37%	59%	355
7	NON-SCHOOL AGENCIES	76%	21%	03%	287
8	PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS	84%	14%	01%	277
9	OTHERS	78%	05%	17%	156

Core team members were asked to rank order 9 sources of referrals to their SAP programs, using numeral 1 as the most frequent source and 9 as least frequent. As shown in Table 30, teachers (n = 373) were ranked first as the most frequently used sources of referrals, followed by (2) administrators (n = 362), (3) self-referrals (n = 342), and (4) peer referrals (n = 350). Because teachers and, to a limited degree, administrators are highly available, these findings reinforce the stipulation that it is critical that continued SAP program training and implementation remain intact and updated. Fewer referrals were made by unrelated private individuals, non-school agencies, and others, as shown in Table 30.

TABLE 31
CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF DEGREE OF COOPERATION RECEIVED BY THE SAP TEAM FROM:

	LOW	AVG	HI	n
TEACHERS	05%	29%	66%	367
ADMINISTRATORS	07%	20%	73%	367
STUDENTS REFERRED	06%	48%	46%	364
OTHER STUDENTS	09%	51%	40%	353
PARENTS	08%	44%	48%	361
SCHOOL BOARD	11%	30%	58%	361
COMMUNITY AGENCIES	09%	26%	66%	362
STAFF	11%	35%	54%	345
NURSE	04%	15%	81%	362
SCHOOL COUNSELOR	02%	10%	88%	365
SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST	08%	19%	73%	340
SOCIAL WORKER	10%	24%	67%	293

Core team members were asked to rank those sources outside the "team" with regard to their cooperation in the implementation phases of SAP programs. As shown in Table 31, social workers (n = 293), other students (n = 353), parents (n = 361), and school boards (n = 361) were most frequently rated relatively less cooperative during implementation of SAP programs. Again, however, teachers (n = 367), administrators (n = 367), and school counselors (n = 365) were most frequently rated as relatively more cooperative. Core team members also were asked to rate the degree of cooperation. Approximately three-fourths of school counselors (88%), nurses (81%), administrators (73%), and school psychologists (73%) were rated as highly cooperative while school boards (11%), staff (11%), and community agencies (9%) were rated lower in terms of cooperation. These findings show the importance of integrating community-based resources into SAPs and continually monitoring the networking between schools, community-based programs, and other related professionals.

Non-Core Team Member Survey

Introduction

The final section of the report focuses on the results of the surveys with non-core team member respondents.

TABLE 32
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PRIMARY ROLE IN SCHOOL DISTRICT
(n = 199)

TEACHERS	89%
ADMINISTRATORS	04%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	07%
TOTAL	100%

As shown in Table 32, the majority (89%) of non-core team members surveyed were teachers. Of non-core team teachers surveyed (n = 178), 98% spend more than half (50%) of their time in classroom instruction.

TABLE 33
PRIMARY COURSE TAUGHT BY NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS WHO ARE TEACHERS
(n = 174)

ENGLISH	21%
SOCIAL STUDIES	14%
MATHEMATICS	13%
SCIENCE	13%
HEALTH/PHYSICAL EDUCATION	07%
BUSINESS	06%
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	06%
SPECIAL EDUCATION	05%
READING	04%
ART	03%
MUSIC	03%
OTHER	03%
INDUSTRIAL ARTS	01%

The non-core team teacher (see Table 33) respondents reported teaching academic courses: English (21%), social studies (14%), math (13%), and science (13%). As was the case with core team respondents, very few non-core team respondents taught art (3%), music (3%), or industrial arts (1%).

TABLE 34
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN PRESENT SCHOOL
(n = 200)

< 6 YEARS	6-15 YEARS	> 15 YEARS
22%	35%	44%

Approximately half (44%) of the non-core team members shown in Table 34 were employed by their present school over 15 years (38% of whom were employed between 16-25 years). An additional one-third (35%) were employed between 6-15 years. While a nearly equal percentage of non-core (35%) and core (37%) team members were employed in their present schools between 6 and 15 years, there was a 7 percentage differential between core (37%) and non-core (44%) respondents employed beyond 15 years in their present schools.

TABLE 35
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EDUCATION
(n = 199)

< 6 YEARS	6-15 YEARS	> 15 YEARS
08%	35%	58%

As shown in Table 35, the majority (58%) of non-core team members surveyed reported they have been in educational-related positions for over 15 years, suggesting that this group is comprised primarily of those who have had considerable experience both in education and at their present school. A similar pattern also was reported among core team respondents.

TABLE 36
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' HIGHEST LEVEL OF FORMAL EDUCATION
(n = 199)

HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA	BACHELORS DEGREE	SOME GRADUATE WORK	MASTERS DEGREE	> MASTERS DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE
01%	05%	32%	28%	34%	02%

Table 36 shows that over half (62%) of non-core team respondents reported having earned at least a master's degree, with an additional one-third (32%) who stated they earned some graduate credits. A similar pattern of responses was noted among core-team members; however, nearly half (40%) of core team respondents said they earned more than a master's degree, while only one-third (34%) of non-core team respondents reported this. It is possible, therefore, that the core-team respondents have been exposed to additional graduate-level education that resulted in their greater interest in SAP programs.

TABLE 37
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' GENDER
(n = 200)

	FEMALE	MALE
TEACHERS	54%	36%
ADMINISTRATORS	01%	03%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	04%	03%
TOTAL	59%	42%

As shown in Table 37, there was a larger percentage of female non-core respondents (59%) than male non-core respondents (42%) overall. Likewise, non-core member female teachers (54%) out numbered non-core male teachers (36%). This gender discrepancy was not reported among female core teachers (26%) and male core teachers (20%), however.

TABLE 38
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' AGE
(n = 200)

TWENTY - TWENTY-NINE	THIRTY - THIRTY-NINE	FORTY - FORTY-NINE	FIFTY - FIFTY-NINE	SIXTY OR OLDER
07%	28%	53%	12%	01%

As illustrated in Table 38, over half (53%) of the non-core respondents were between the ages of 40-49, with an additional approximately one-fourth (28%) between the ages of 30-39. This pattern of age groups also was reported among core-team respondents, although considerably fewer non-core respondents were considerably fewer in the 50-59 category (12%) than were core team respondents (20%).

TABLE 39
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS WHO HAVE MADE REFERRALS TO THE SAP TEAM
(n = 199)

TEACHERS	68%
ADMINISTRATORS	02%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	06%
TOTAL	76%

Over three-fourths (76%) of non-core team members shown in Table 39 said they had made referrals to SAPs, most of whom were teachers.

TABLE 40
NUMBER OF REFERRALS MADE BY NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS
(n = 143)

	1	2	3	4	5-10	11-20	>20
TEACHERS	08%	22%	23%	11%	19%	05%	01%
ADMINISTRATORS	00%	00%	01%	00%	01%	00%	01%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	01%	01%	00%	01%	04%	00%	01%
TOTAL	09%	23%	24%	12%	24%	05%	03%

Of all non-core team respondents who have made referrals to SAPs, over half (59%) made between 2-4 referrals. Nearly half (45%) of non-core teachers who responded made 2 or 3 referrals, while virtually no administrators (1%) made referrals. This finding supports the notion that educators who are inclined to interact with students on a daily basis are more likely to make referrals.

TABLE 41
BEHAVIORS OBSERVED*, RESULTING IN REFERRAL BY NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS
(n = 152)

POOR GRADES	53%
SUBSTANCE ABUSE	45%
DEPRESSION	43%
ABSENTEEISM	40%
WITHDRAWN BEHAVIORS	38%
DISCIPLINE	37%
SELF ESTEEM	33%
SUICIDAL IDEATION	31%
DELINQUENCY	16%
OTHER	15%
ANOREXIA NERVOSA	09%
SMOKING	07%
RUNNING AWAY	05%
PREGNANCY	03%

* Because respondents were asked to identify as many observed behaviors as applicable, percentages total more than 100%.

Those non-core members who made referrals to SAPs also were asked to identify all behaviors they observed that led them to make SAP referrals. As shown in Table 41, the 5 most frequently cited behaviors leading to referrals included: poor grades (53%), substance abuse (45%), depression (43%), absenteeism (40%), and withdrawn behaviors (38%). Those observable behaviors leading to referrals that non-core members cited less frequently were pregnancy (3%), running away (5%), and smoking (7%).

TABLE 42
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' SATISFACTION WITH RESPONSE TO REFERRAL
(n = 135)

TEACHERS	78%
ADMINISTRATORS	03%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	08%
TOTAL	89%

Non-core respondents who made referrals to SAPs also were asked if they were satisfied with the responses to their referrals (Table 42). Over three-fourths (78%) of the teachers and 8% of pupil personnel representatives affirmed their satisfaction.

TABLE 43
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS WHO HAVE NEVER REFERRED,
BUT WOULD IF NECESSARY
(n = 86)

TEACHERS	87%
ADMINISTRATORS	05%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	05%
TOTAL	97%

Of the nearly one-fourth (24%) of non-core members who <u>never</u> referred students to SAPs, the majority (97%) said they would if necessary. That is, nearly all teachers (87%), administrators (5%), and pupil personnel (5%) indicated they would refer students if necessary (Table 43).

TABLE 44
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN INSERVICE TRAINING
(n = 169)

TEACHERS	63%
ADMINISTRATORS	04%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	04%
TOTAL	71%

Of the 197 non-core members surveyed, most (n = 169; 86%) said their schools provided inservice training about SAPs. As shown in Table 44, nearly three-fourths (71%) of this group participated in the inservice training, most of whom were teachers (63%).

TABLE 45
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF QUALITY OF TRAINING
(n = 147)

	LOW	AVG	HI
TEACHERS	11%	36%	42%
ADMINISTRATION	00%	01%	02%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	01%	04%	03%
TOTAL	12%	41%	47%

Next, those non-core team members who participated in SAP inservice training or orientations were asked to rate the overall quality of the training on a 7-point scale ranging from 1=low to 7=high. Table 45 illustrates the quality ratings of teachers, administrators, and pupil personnel professionals. Nearly half (41%) rated SAP training as average, while the other half (47%) rated the quality of SAP training high.

TABLE 46
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECT OF SAP ON THEIR SCHOOL
(n = 176)

VERY HELPFUL	SOMEWHAT HELPFUL	NOT HELPFUL
62%	31%	07%

Table 46 illustrates the responses of non-core team members regarding the perception of the effect of SAP inservice training and implementation in their schools. Nearly two-thirds (62%) of those responding said it was very helpful, while the remaining approximately on-third (31%) noted it was at least somewhat helpful. Only 7% of respondents mentioned availability of SAPs as not at all helpful. This finding demonstrates the potential for SAPs in schools in that non-core members generally felt it was helpful and contributing to the common good.

TABLE 47
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SAP PURPOSE
(n = 185)

	ADEQUATE UNDERSTANDING	LIMITED UNDERSTANDING	NEGATIVE UNDERSTANDING
TEACHERS	52%	35%	02%
ADMINISTRATORS	03%	01%	00%
PUPIL PERSONNEL	05%	02%	01%
TOTAL	60%	37%	03%

Finally, non-core members were asked to rate their understanding of the purpose of SAPs. As shown in Table 47, over half (60%) of all respondents noted an adequate understanding, and over one-third (37%) said they had a limited understanding, suggesting that at least a general knowledge of the features of SAPs, its purpose, and potential influence on the lives of students is available. Likewise, over half (52%) of responding teachers felt their understanding of SAPs was adequate, and over one-third (35%) said their understanding of SAPs was limited.

RESULTS OF SCHOOL-WIDE IMPACT ANALYSIS

Eleven schools with SAPs trained during the period of this study had also taken the Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) before and after SAP training. The post-testing occurred 1 or 2 years after training. A control group was identified and statistically adjusted on three variables:

1. Grade enrollment (indicator of school size)
2. Community size
3. Parental education (indicator of socio-economic status)

Twenty-eight items were selected from the Educational Quality Assessment scales that reflected what were considered by our research team to be desirable outcomes for Student Assistance Programs. (See Appendix B). An analysis of covariance with repeated measures was run using substance use, self-esteem and decision making items as dependent variables and compared schools with SAP trained teams and non-SAP schools. Students in schools with SAPs scored slightly higher on 18 of the 28 items and statistical significance was indicated on one of the 18 items.

Students in SAP schools were significantly ($P<.02$) more likely to talk to friends about the risks of smoking (See Appendix B). This statistical difference is based on the school as the unit of analysis.

Of the remaining 17 items on which the differences appeared favorable but were not statistically significant, the following <u>important differences</u> appeared to exist between the SAP and non-SAP schools:

1. Students in schools with SAP programs may be likely to ask a teacher to help a friend and to tell friends about the risks of smoking.

2. Students in schools with SAP programs may be less likely to drink beer or liquor and to take caffeine or aspirins.

3. Students in schools with SAP programs may be similar to those in non-SAP schools regarding attitudes about smoking marijuana.

4. Students in schools with SAP programs may be less likely to buy pills and smoke cigarettes.

5. Students in schools with SAP programs may be more likely to have higher self-esteem and feel accepted by friends and teachers.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of the various components of this evaluation the following conclusions and recommendations are germane:

1. SAP teams were satisfied with the majority of their training components although some components were identified that may need to be enhanced in order to improve the training.

2. SAP team members were concerned about training for aftercare services for students referred to outside agencies. The initial training should cover this aspect but the follow-up training should particularly emphasize this dimension. SAPs will probably be more receptive to aftercare issues once they are in operation.

3. SAPs were implemented within the same school year as their training.

4. Even though the Pennsylvania model is designed as a low cost option for implementing SAPs, most teams have been given budgets and release time for their service. Many coordinators feel their budgets are insufficient or unclearly defined.

5. The most common problems referred to SAPs include substance abuse, poor grades, depression, discipline and suicidal ideation.

6. Teachers are the most common source of referrals. However, referrals do come from a variety of sources.

7. Community agencies are a referral source for only 1/2 of SAPs. Earlier involvement of community agencies and/or greater representation on the SAP teams by community agency personnel should be explored.

8. The school-wide impact study revealed some evidence of favorable effects in schools with SAPs regarding drug use and self-esteem. However, there is a need for a more specific impact study limited to those students actually referred to and involved in the SAP process in order to more clearly document the effects of SAPs on referred students.

9. SAP team members were generally favorable in their ratings of implementation efforts, as were non-core team members.

10. SAP teams tend to consist of experienced professionals and be led by school administrators.
11. Men dominate the leadership positions in the SAPs although women outnumber men on the teams.

12. When families of SAP referees are involved, they are usually cooperative.

13. Community support for SAPs was generally good.

14. Non-SAP team colleagues generally favorable toward and supportive of the program and team members appreciative of their response. (The core team concept seems to have achieved general acceptance and support both within the teams and outside of them.)

REFERENCES

Bachman, J., Johnson, L., & O'Mally, P. (1986). Monitoring the future. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Institute for Survey Research.

Bennett, W. J. (1987). What works. Schools without drugs. (DOE Publication No. 178-865). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Borris, A. F. (1988). Organizational models. Student Assistance Journal, 1, 31-33.

Friedman, A. S., Glickman, N., & Utada, A. (1985). Does drug and alcohol use lead to failure to graduate from high school? Journal of Drug Education, 15, 353-364.

Griffin, T. & Svendson, R. (1988, Nov./Dec.). Three SAP Organizational Models, Student Assistance Journal, pp. 31-33.

Kandel, D. (1980). Drug and drinking behavior among youth. Annual Review of Sociology, 6, 235-285.

Kelley, J. M., & Peters, C. P. (1989). The Pennsylvania model for implementing SAPs. Student Assistance Journal, Jan/Feb, 19-22, 39-41.

Roman, P. M. (1989). Perils, payoffs of technology transfer. Employee Assistance, 1, 16-17.

Swisher, J. D., & Hu, T. (1983). Alternatives to drug abuse: Some are and some are not. In T. Glynn, C. Luekefeld, and J. Ludford (Eds.), Preventing adolescent drug abuse (NIDA Research Monograph No. 47). Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Swisher, J. D., Shute, R., & Bibeau, D. (1984). Assessing drug and alcohol abuse. An investment for planning and evaluation. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 17, 91-97.

APPENDIX A
EQA ITEMS INCLUDED IN SCHOOL-WIDE IMPACT ANALYSIS

1 = Definitely Would
2 = Probably Would
3 = Probably Would Not
4 = Definitely Would Not

01)	PBEER	My friends decide to have a party. One person brings a case of beer. Everyone else agrees to drink several cans. I would DRINK THE **BEER**.
02)	PASPIRIN	The doctor tells me to take two aspirin tablets every four hours for a fever. A friend says the fever would go down faster by taking two tablets every two hours. Since I want to go to a party tomorrow, I would TAKE THE EXTRA **ASPIRIN**.
03)	PCOLA	I usually drink several colas in the evening and stay up late since I can't seem to sleep. A teacher says that colas contain caffeine. I know that truckers often drink coffee because the caffeine in it helps to keep them awake when driving. I would STOP DRINKING **COLAS**.
04)	PDISCUSS	In health class I learned about a program for people with alcohol problems. I have a friend who I think has a drinking problem. I would **DISCUSS** THE PROGRAM WITH MY FRIEND.
05)	PLEAVE	I am at a large party with some friends. We are in one of several rooms in which the party is being held. Some of the other persons in the room begin to pass around a marijuana cigarette and start to smoke. I would **LEAVE** THE ROOM IMMEDIATELY.
06)	PSMOKE	The school administrators have set a special time and place for smoking. For this reason some students say that **smoking** is okay. I would AGREE WITH THEM.
07)	PPILLS	Outside a nearby shopping center a man is selling diet pills. My sister is always trying to lose weight. I would BUY SOME OF THE **PILLS** FOR HER.

08)	PSMOKE2	In health class I learned about smoking and lung cancer. A friend has just started **smoking**. I would TELL MY FRIEND WHAT I LEARNED.
09)	PPILLS2	While at home alone, I get a headache. I go to the medicine cabinet and find my mother's headache pills. I would TAKE ONE OF MY MOTHER'S **PILLS**.
10)	PSMOKE3	After school I am talking with some friends and someone offers me a cigarette. I would **SMOKE** THE CIGARETTE.
11)	PLIQUOR	I am enjoying myself at a party with a group of friends. Someone gets out a bottle of **liquor** and begins mixing drinks. I would HAVE A DRINK.
12)	PSMOKEY	I am attending a meeting of a community group. The person next to me is smoking. It is obviously bothering an elderly person sitting near me. I would ASK THE PERSON TO STOP **SMOKING** FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.
13)	PFLASK	I am driving some friends home from the game. One of them passes around a flask. I would HAVE A DRINK FROM THE **FLASK**.
14)	PMEDICIN	When I had an infection three months ago, the doctor prescribed some medicine. The medicine worked so well that I had some left. Now I think I am getting a similar infection. I would TAKE THE LEFTOVER **MEDICINE**.
15)	PPOT	I am at a picnic with some friends. They pass around a **marijuana** cigarette and start to smoke. I would TRY THE CIGARETTE.
16)	PPILLS2	While at a dance I develop a terrible cramp in my leg. I can barely walk. One of the girls offers me some pills that she got for sore muscles. I would TAKE THE **PILLS** SO I COULD ENJOY THE DANCE.
17)	PASKTEACH	One of my best friends has a drinking problem. The friend sneaks drinks during school. I have offered suggestions, but it doesn't help. I would **ASK** A **TEACHER** WHO HELPS STUDENTS TO TALK TO MY FRIEND.

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Mostly Agree
3 = Mostly Disagree
4 = Strongly Disagree

01)	PACCEPT	I feel **accepted** by my classmates.
02)	PIMPORTAN	I feel that my classmates do not consider me to be **important.**
03)	PDECISIO	I think that this school has prepared me to make better **decisions** about life's problems.
04)	PCAREER	My planning a **career** is a waste of time.
05)	PLIKED	I often feel that others are better **liked** than I am.
06)	PCANTDO	I'm the sort of person who **can't do** anything in school really well.
07)	PCONFIDE	I feel that my classmates have **confidence** in me.
08)	PFRIENDS	I do not make **friends** as easily as most other people.
09)	PREALPEO	Students in this school are treated like real **people.**
10)	PACCEPTE	I feel **accepted** by most of my teachers.
11)	PDISCOUR	I often become **discouraged** in school.
12)	PNOTGOOD	My teachers sometimes make me feel that I'm **"not good** enough".

APPENDIX B

POST-TEST MEANS FOR SAP SCHOOLS VS. NON-SAP SCHOOLS
(Adjusted for pre-test means, grade enrollment,parental education, and community size.)

	CODE	SAP SCHOOLS MEAN	NON-SAP SCHOOLS MEAN		CODE	SAP SCHOOLS MEAN	NON-SAP SCHOOLS MEAN
*	PBEER	2.43	2.37		PPILLS2	3.07	3.12
*	PASPIRIN	3.21	3.14	*	PASKTEACH	2.65	2.52
*	PCOLA	2.54	2.45	*	PACCEPT	3.33	3.22
*	PDISCUSS	2.99	2.94	*	PIMPORTAN	3.05	2.98
*	PLEAVE	2.95	2.95		PDECISIO	2.62	2.68
*	PSMOKE	3.00	3.01	*	PCAREER	3.62	3.52
**	PSMOKE2	3.04	2.85	*	PLIKED	2.40	2.38
	PPILLS	2.87	2.90	*	PCANTDO	3.13	3.04
	PSMOKE3	3.20	3.26	*	PCONFIDE	3.09	2.99
*	PLIQUOR	2.43	2.42	*	PFRIENDS	3.05	3.02
*	PSMOKE4	2.77	2.72		PREALPEO	2.53	2.67
*	PFLASK	3.20	3.19	*	PACCEPTE	3.19	3.07
	PMEDICIN	2.97	3.01		PDISCOUR	2.51	2.61
	PPOT	3.32	3.36	*	PNOTGOOD	2.92	2.81

* High score is better.
** $P<.02$

APPENDIX C
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE
(Post-test score adjusted by pre-test score, type of community, grade enrollment, and parental education.)

SOURCE	dF	ADJUSTED SS	F
Covariates:			
Group	1	0.1118	6.71*
Pre-test score	1	0.0291	1.75
Type of community	1	0.0087	0.52
Grade enrollment	1	0.0065	0.39
Parental education	1	0.0149	0.89
		SS	
Explained	5	0.1785	2.14
Residual	16	0.2665	
Total	21	0.4450	

* P<.02

Note: Pre- and post-test scores were for EQA item #8:

> In health class I learned about smoking and lung cancer. A friend has just started smoking. I would tell my friend what I learned.

APPENDIX D
CORE TEAM COORDINATOR TELEPHONE SURVEY

Coordinator: _____ School #: _____

SAP TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE:

Good (Morning/Afternoon),

Allow me to begin by introducing myself. My name is _____ I am a research assistant at The Pennsylvania State University. I am going to be asking you questions about the SAP program. You should have received a letter explaining that you would be contacted by phone to discuss your participation with SAP, including an outline of content to help prepare you to answer the questions. Our conversation today should take approximately thirty minutes and neither you nor your school will be identified. All answers are strictly confidential. Only summary data by groups of schools will be released. Do you have any questions before we begin? _____

_____

_____

_____

We need some background information about you.

1. Which of the following best describes your primary role in the school district?

___ a. School board member
___ b. Teacher
___ c. Administrator
___ d. Pupil personnel services
___ e. Custodial
___ f. Bus driver
___ g. Dining room staff
___ h. Other (specify _____)

2. Are you a classroom teacher; that is, do you spend more than 50% of your time in classroom instruction? If no, skip question #3.

___ a. Yes
___ b. No

3. If the answer to the previous question was "yes", answer this question: I teach mostly in the department best identified by the descriptor.

___ a. Business
___ b. English
___ c. Foreign languages
___ d. Mathematics
___ e. Reading
___ f. Social Studies
___ g. Science
___ h. Health/Phys.Ed.
___ i. Art
___ j. Music
___ k. Industrial arts
___ l. Special education
___ m. Vocational agriculture
___ n. Other (specify _____)

4. How long have you been working in your present school?

___ a. 1 year or less
___ b. 2-5 years
___ c. 6-15 years
___ d. 16-25 years
___ e. 26-35 years
___ f. Over 35 years

5. How long have you been working in education?

___ a. 1 year or less
___ b. 2-5 years
___ c. 6-15 years
___ d. 16-25 years
___ e. 26-35 years
___ f. Over 35 years

6. Which of the following best describes your highest level of formal education?

___ a. High school diploma
___ b. Bachelor's degree
___ c. some graduate study
___ d. Master's degree
___ e. Specialist's certificate or some work beyond Master's degree
___ f. Doctoral degree

7. Your gender is

___ a. Female
___ b. Male

8. Your age is

___ a. 20-29 years
___ b. 30-39 years
___ c. 40-49 years
___ d. 50-59 years
___ e. 60 or more years

The first set of questions will focus on implementation of the program.

1. What do you call your program?
   ___ SAP ___ Other (write out name below)

   _____

2. What is the title of the individual who you would say is responsible for coordinating the (SAP /use name of program) in your school district?]
   ___ Director ___ Team Leader
   ___ Coordinator ___ Other

3. How quickly was your program in operation after the training program was completed? (Select the response from the following choices that comes closest to reality; "in operation" means that students were identified and contacted.
   ___ less than one month
   ___ one to two months
   ___two to ___ months
   ___ ___ to ___ months
   ___ over one year
   ___ years
   ___ not in operation yet

   If in operation, skip question #4.

4. If your answer to the previous question was "not in operation yet," please explain briefly. _____
_____
_____
_____

(If not in operation end the interview.)

Thank you for your help. Your comments will be useful for understanding the status of SAPs in Pennsylvania.

5. What degree of recognition is afforded to the SAP by your school district?
___ office space
___ organizational chart
___ release time
___ budget
___ other

6. How would you describe the building administration's attitude toward the SAP?
_____
_____
_____

7. How would you describe community support of your district's SAP? (Give examples)_____
_____
_____

The next questions will focus on the referral process and identified students.

1. What kind of behaviors are students manifesting who are referred to your program?

___ substance abuse (specify _____)

___ discipline
___ delinquency
___ smoking
___ running away
___ pregnancy
___ anorexia nervosa
___ other
___ withdrawn behaviors
___ poor grades
___ absenteeism
___ depression
___ suicidal ideation
___ self esteem

2. What is the process for identifying students? _____

_____

_____

3. When referrals are made to your SAP team, what is the first step in responding?

4. Second step?

5. Third step?

6. Fourth step?

7. Fifth step?

8. Others (please list one per line)

a.
b.
c.
d.
e.

9. How would you describe the involvement of the school district's central administration in your SAP?

10. How are faculty members made aware of the SAP process in your school? ___ Memos ___ Meetings ___ Workshops ___ Other
Describe _____
_____
_____

11. Are materials provided to help make parents aware of your SAP?
_____ What are these materials? _____
_____
_____

12. In what percentage of cases are families involved in the intervention process?
___ 0 - 25%
___ 25 - 50%
___ 50 - 75%
___ 75 - 100%

13. What form(s) does the family participation take ? (check all that apply)
___ letters
___ conferences
___ telephone calls
___ other (specify _____)

14. How are identified students referred? (check all that apply)
___ Teachers
___ Staff
___ Parents
___ Students
___ Self
___ Community Agency
___ Nurse
___ Counselor
___ Other

15. Who is the primary source for referrals?

___ Teachers
___ Staff
___ Parents
___ Students
___ Self
___ Community Agency
___ Nurse
___ Counselor
___ Other

16. Are parents contacted? _____

When? _____

_____

How? _____

_____

What percentage of parents respond?

___ 0 - 25%
___ 25 - 50%
___ 50 - 75%
___ 75 - 100%

What percentage of parents are helpful?

___ 0 - 25%
___ 25 - 50%
___ 50 - 75%
___ 75 - 100%

17. What criteria are used to warrant referral to an outside agency?_____

_____

_____

18. Can you estimate what percentage of the identified students are referred to outside agencies?

___ 10%
___ 20%
___ 30%
___ 40%
___ 50%
___ 60%
___ 70%
___ 80%
___ 90%
___ 100%

19. What are some of the agencies to whom referrals have been made?
___ Psychologists in private practice
___ Residential treatment for D&A
___ Residential mental health services
___ Outpatient mental health
___ Outpatient treatment for D&A
___ Inpatient treatment for D&A
___ Hospitals
___ Law enforcement
___ Other (group home, aftercare programs, etc.)

20. Of those stated, which are the three most often used as referral resources?
___ Psychologists in private practice
___ Residential treatment for D&A
___ Residential mental health services
___ Outpatient mental health
___ Outpatient treatment for D&A
___ Inpatient treatment for D&A
___ Hospitals
___ Law enforcement
___ Other (group home, aftercare programs, etc.)

21. What percentage of the identified students would you say are helped within the school system, in an academic year, by your own services? _____

22. For those students who are helped in the school system, what methods are used?
___ Special groups (describe _____
_____)
___ Individual counseling
___ Other

23. What percentage of the identified students in an academic year receive formal follow-up/after care services after receiving outside or specialized school treatment? _____

24. Can you tell me the approximate percentage of identified students who are still in school? _____ or who eventually graduated? _____

The next set of questions covers financial issues.

1. Is there a budget for the SAP at your school?
   ___ Yes ___ No

2. Is the budget adequate?
   ___ Yes ___ Somewhat ___ No

3. What would you estimate are the yearly costs of the SAP to your school district?

4. Are any members of the core-team given released time for their SAP work? (describe)

5. If any members of the core-team receive released-time for their SAP work, what positions do they normally hold (e.g., teacher, administrator, counselor)?

6. Do team members receive pay for participating on the core-team?
   ___ Yes ___ No

The following questions focus primarily on the core-team.

1. Who decides core-team membership? _____
_____

2. How have core-team memberships changed since the implementation of the SAP in your school district? _____
_____

3. Has the core-team received any of these levels of authorization from the school board?
___ Give detention
___ Limit activities
___ Refer
___ Contact parents
___ Give tests/Self-evaluation
___ Do groups
___ Keep separate, confidential records

4. How often does the core-team meet? _____
_____

5. How would you describe relationships among the core-team members?
_____
_____

6. Describe core-team member turn-around. _____
_____
_____

We have completed the questionnaire. Do you have anything you can add or any questions about this survey? Well, I hope your ear survived this ordeal. You have been very helpful, your time and effort are appreciated. It should prove interesting to collect the data from schools involved with SAP and determine how SAP is working. And your contribution will certainly add to this interesting data. A copy of our report will be made available in the fall. It has been a pleasure talking with you on the phone. If you have future questions, they can be directed to _____ by calling _____ or writing to _____. Thanks again for your help. Have a good day, Goodbye!

SAP1-R6
Rev. 02/16/90
/kmk

APPENDIX E
CORE TEAM MEMBER SURVEY

We are interested in your perceptions and opinions about the services offered and/or coordinated by the SAP team. Only aggregate reports summarizing answers for groups of schools will be reported. We do not need your name or any other identifying data on the survey.

Biographical Data

Directions: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability by marking (X) those choices that best describe you.

1. Which of the following best describes your primary role in the school district?

___ a. School board member
___ b. Teacher
___ c. Administrator
___ d. Counselor
___ e. School psychologist
___ f. Social worker
___ g. Dining room staff
___ h. Custodial
___ i. Secretary
___ j. Bus driver
___ k. Nurse
___ l. Other (specify _____)

2. Are you a classroom teacher; that is, do you spend more than 50% of your time in classroom instruction? If no, skip to question #4.

___ a. Yes
___ b. No

3. If the answer to the previous question was "yes", answer this question: I teach mostly in the department best identified by the descriptor.

___ a. Business
___ b. English
___ c. Foreign languages
___ d. Mathematics
___ e. Reading
___ f. Social Studies
___ g. Science
___ h. Health/Phys.Ed.
___ i. Art
___ j. Music
___ k. Industrial arts
___ l. Special education
___ m. Vocational agriculture
___ n. Other (specify _____)

4. How long have you been working in your present school?
   - ___ a. 1 year or less
   - ___ b. 2-5 years
   - ___ c. 6-15 years
   - ___ d. 16-25 years
   - ___ e. 26-35 years
   - ___ f. Over 35 years

5. How long have you been working in education?
   - ___ a. 1 year or less
   - ___ b. 2-5 years
   - ___ c. 6-15 years
   - ___ d. 16-25 years
   - ___ e. 26-35 years
   - ___ f. Over 35 years

6. Which of the following best describes your highest level of formal education?
   - ___ a. High school diploma
   - ___ b. Bachelor's degree
   - ___ c. some graduate study
   - ___ d. Master's degree
   - ___ e. Specialist's certificate or some work beyond Master's degree
   - ___ f. Doctoral degree

7. Your gender is
   - ___ a. Female
   - ___ b. Male

8. Your age range is
   - ___ a. 20-29 years
   - ___ b. 30-39 years
   - ___ c. 40-49 years
   - ___ d. 50-59 years
   - ___ e. 60 or more years

SAP Training

For the following items use the scale, circling the number on the scale that best indicates your opinion. Rate the quality and usefulness of the following training modules based on your initial SAP training:

		Low		Average				High
1.	SAP Overview	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Adolescent development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	The nature of chemical dependency	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Adolescent depression and suicide	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Family dynamics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Children of alcoholics / dysfunctional families	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	The enabling process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	The student assessment and intervention process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	The treatment process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Continuity of care (recovery and after care)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Psychodrama	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Group process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Formal and informal intervention	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Team intervention	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Team maintenance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Individual process in groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Program Development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Action plan for program implementation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Others (Please list separately)							
	a. _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	b. _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Perceptions of Student Assistance Implementation

Directions: Of the services listed below, use the space to the left of the page to check those services provided to help students via the SAP. Also, use the rating scale to the right of the page to rate how well each service is provided.

Functions		Low			Average			High
___ 1.	inservice training for faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 2.	awareness program for students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 3.	awareness program for parents/guardians	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 4.	identification of identified students needing help	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 5.	referral of identified students to core-team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 6.	core-team consultation with identified students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 7.	consultation with identified students by individual members of the core-team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 8.	referring students to outside agencies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 9.	alternative treatment programs in the school for identified students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 10.	system for monitoring progress of identified students who have been referred for treatment service outside of the school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 11.	Team meetings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ 12.	system for offering helping services (e.g., counseling) to identified students while they also receive treatment services outside of the school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Low			Average			High
___	13. formal after-care arrangements with treatment facilities serving identified students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___	14. a planned set of services for helping identified students to adjust and function adequately upon returning to school following treatment services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___	15. groups in school for students (e.g. D/A intervention, loss, growth/ development)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. Rank order from 1-9 the sources of referrals to your SAP program using the number 1 as the most frequent source of referrals.

Rank

___ school's teachers
___ school's administrators
___ self-referrals
___ peer referrals
___ parent or guardian referrals
___ other professionals (e.g., school psychologist, counselor)
___ non-school agencies
___ unrelated private individual
___ others (please specify) _____

For items 17 through 28, use the following scale by circling the number on the scale that best reflects your opinion. Estimate the degree of cooperation the SAP team received from the:

		Low			Average			High
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	teaching staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	school administrators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	students referred	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	other students	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	parents	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	school board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	community agencies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	staff (secretary, custodian, bus driver, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	nurse	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	school counselor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	school psychologist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	social worker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Thank you for your assistance. A copy of this study will be sent to your school in the fall.

SAP2-R6.1
Rev. 02/90
/kmk

APPENDIX F
NON-CORE TEAM MEMBER SURVEY

Biographical Data

Directions: We are interested in knowing about your awareness of the school districts' Student Assistance Program. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability by marking (X) those choices that best describe you.

1. Which of the following best describes your primary role in the school district?

___ a. School board member
___ b. Teacher
___ c. Administrator
___ d. Counselor
___ e. School psychologist
___ f. Social worker
___ g. Dining room staff
___ h. Custodial
___ i. Secretary
___ j. Bus driver
___ k. Nurse
___ l. Other (specify _____)

2. Are you a classroom teacher; that is, do you spend more than 50% of your time in classroom instruction? If no, skip to question #4.

___ a. Yes
___ b. No

3. If the answer to the previous question was "yes", answer this question: I teach mostly in the department best identified by the descriptor.

___ a. Business
___ b. English
___ c. Foreign languages
___ d. Mathematics
___ e. Reading
___ f. Social Studies
___ g. Science
___ h. Health/Phys.Ed.
___ i. Art
___ j. Music
___ k. Industrial arts
___ l. Special education
___ m. Vocational agriculture
___ n. Other (specify _____)

4. How long have you been working in your present school?

___ a. 1 year or less
___ b. 2-5 years
___ c. 6-15 years
___ d. 16-25 years
___ e. 26-35 years
___ f. Over 35 years

5. How long have you been working in education?

___ a. 1 year or less
___ b. 2-5 years
___ c. 6-15 years
___ d. 16-25 years
___ e. 26-35 years
___ f. Over 35 years

6. Which of the following best describes your highest level of formal education?

___ a. High school diploma
___ b. Bachelor's degree
___ c. some graduate study
___ d. Master's degree
___ e. Specialist's certificate or some work beyond Master's degree
___ f. Doctoral degree

7. Your gender is

___ a. Female
___ b. Male

8. Your age range is

___ a. 20-29 years
___ b. 30-39 years
___ c. 40-49 years
___ d. 50-59 years
___ e. 60 or more years

SAP Data

1. Briefly, how would you describe your understanding of the purpose of the SAP?

2. Have you made any referrals to the SAP team?
   ___ a. Yes ___ b. No
   If the answer to this question was "Yes," answer the next three questions. If "No," skip to question #6.

3. How many referrals have you made?

4. What behaviors were the students you referred exhibiting that caused you to refer them?
   ___ substance abuse (specify _____)
   ___ discipline
   ___ delinquency
   ___ smoking
   ___ running away
   ___ pregnancy
   ___ anorexia nervosa
   ___ other
   ___ withdrawn behaviors
   ___ poor grades
   ___ absenteeism
   ___ depression
   ___ suicidal ideation
   ___ self esteem

5. Were you satisfied with the response to your referral?
   ___ a. Yes ___ b. No

6. If you have not made any referrals to the SAP team, would you make any referrals to the SAP team if the need occurred?
   ___ a. Yes ___ b. No

7. If the answer to the previous question was "No," please explain briefly.

8. Has there been inservice training to inform faculty members about the SAP in your school?

___ a. Yes ___ b. No

9. If the answer to the previous question was "Yes," did you participate in the training or orientation activitiy?

___ a. Yes ___ b. No

10. Rate the quality of the training on the scale below.

low average high

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. How has the SAP benefited your school?

Thank you for your assistance. A copy of this study will be sent to your school in the fall.

SAP3-R4.1
02/90
/kmk